LEARNING OUTCOMES OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (LOOC)
Minutes from Wednesday, December 3, 2008
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

In Attendance:

Marilyn Barbour       Anne Hubbard
Gary Boden            Deborah Rosen
John Boulmetis        John Stevenson
Joanna Burkhardt      Bette Erickson
Elaine Finan          Chip Yensan
Carolyn Hames         Judith Swift (Chair)
Kathleen Torrens

Judith Swift called the meeting to order; minutes of the meeting of November 19, 2008 were approved with several revisions requested by Gary Boden, and a note to include Bette Erickson among the attendees.

Deborah Rosen reported for Mark Higgins (also see handout)

Recommendations presented based on goals for the data:

1. There should be a place to store the information – Institutional Research was suggested. There will need to be more resources if the data are to be archived, synthesized and analyzed in that office. It was agreed that there needs to be a central collection point for assessment data.
2. The data need to be assessed: A letter was sent from this subcommittee to the colleges asking for data, and for data from the previous three years. The goal is to gather all the information to learn from each other.
3. The data should be classified into four groups to be easier for handling, analyzing and reviewing by various groups.

They recommend a workshop be held to guide faculty in the ways of using data to better the institution.

Discussion
Marilyn Barbour: Asked about True Outcomes assessment information fitting into the proposed schema; where would the development of a program assessment instruments fit into the groupings as well.
Deborah Rosen: Mark Higgins suggested the first workshop could examine data from one segment of the data groups, i.e. Group 1 data.
John Stevenson: Caution to consider how much transparency is preferred reminding us of earlier conversations regarding data access, different levels of information, different forms, i.e. hard copy, e-mails, etc. (data are not all survey, but reflections, artifacts, etc.)
Anne Hubbard: Noted that groups 1 and 2 represented predominantly the Kingston population, not the students typical of the Providence campus, nor Graduate Students.
Deborah Rosen: Suggested that population would be in Group 4.
Gary Boden: noted Career services included graduate students in their recent survey.
Judith Swift: IR does not have enough people to do analysis.
Gary Boden: In the last six months emphasis was put on collecting data and making it available via a redesign of the website. He mentioned that at this time, IR does not have the time and/or skill to analyze the data and may need help from the committee.
Judith Swift noted the role of the committee is to make policy and recommendations, but not to be involved in collecting, analyzing or synthesizing data, suggesting that perhaps IR will really need to support that effort to reduce or remove the possibility that people may choose the data that best supports their agenda.
Judith Swift: Noted initial university outcomes had been developed at a meeting held at the Alton Jones campus several years ago in conjunction with Peggy Maki. They need to be resurrected and reviewed in comparison with what is currently publicized in the catalog. If differences are found and amendments to the currently publicized outcomes are agreed upon, changes can be recommended to the Faculty Senate.

- We need to remember that we want to make policy to present to the Faculty Senate.
- The Data subcommittee is very important because it gives us a basis for recommending policy. We need to decide where and how to bring out policy in the most beneficial light as a committee.
- The new SET is a great opportunity for data gathering; perhaps some workshops would be beneficial to help with effective user of the instrument. Judith would like a copy of what the new SET looks like before the next LOOC meeting.
- We need to do an analysis of all the surveys to see where the holes are and what data is already being gathered. The Data subcommittee should get copies of the surveys.

Marilyn Barbour suggested a full day retreat

Judith Swift: Have a few groups to each look over several surveys.

Gary Boden: noted he has a broad knowledge of most of the surveys.

Judith Swift asked members to e-mail her if they have a preference to review a certain survey.

John Stevenson noted the VSA – Voluntary System of Accountability as another data issue.

Judith Swift summarized where we are:

- Gary Boden will look at the different surveys
- Members will look at surveys to see where holes are; choose an individual data group
- A notice will be sent to LOOC members for a meeting
- Committee should develop an institution-wide survey to fill in the holes that we don’t already have data on

2. Miscellaneous

Bette Erickson: Offered that Provost DeHayes asked Bob Shea to collaborate part-time in the Assessment office. Bette suggested an alternative be considered to fill the interim position. Bette added that IDP will participate and support any effort that that directly improves teaching at the university.

Judith Swift also noted that IDP and Assessment are separate entities.

Judith Swift mentioned the December 5, 2008 Webinar featuring Dr. George Kuh “National Dialog on Student Retention”. Jayne Richmond has details about the location, etc.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Next Meeting: January 28, 2009